

### REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Examiner's Action mailed January 6, 2005, with a shortened statutory period of three months set to expire April 6, 2005. Claims 1-33 are currently pending. With this amendment, claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 23, and 24 have been amended.

The independent claims, claims 1, 12, and 23, have been amended to describe the subclass being a subclass of the base class. The base class and subclass are both included within an object. An attribute is defined within the subclass. Attribute data defined for the attribute is stored only within the base class. One example of support for these amendments can be found in the specification on page 9, lines 12-17.

Claims 2, 13, and 24 have been amended to describe defining a first subclass and a second subclass within the object. The first subclass is a subclass of the base class. The second subclass is a subclass of the first subclass. A first attribute is defined within the first subclass. A second attribute is defined within the second subclass. Attribute data defined for the first and second attributes is stored within only the base class and not within either the first or second subclasses.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0152294 published by *Evans*. This rejection, as it might be applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that *Evans* teaches a root class in figure 15 and paragraph 0010. The Examiner also states that *Evans* teaches defining an attribute within a subclass and storing attribute data defined for the attribute at figure 14 and paragraphs 0146-0150. The Examiner further states that the data is stored in the MIB tables which contain the values of the defined attributes of the subclasses.

*Evans* does not teach Applicants' claims. *Evans* does not teach storing data within the object where the base class and subclass are defined. Figure 13 of *Evans* teaches defining various classes and subclasses. The attribute data is not stored here according to Figure 13. The attribute data, according to the Examiner, is stored in a table, such as depicted by Figure 11. The classes and subclasses are not defined in the table depicted by Figure 11.

*Evans* does not teach storing attribute data only within the base class. According to *Evans*, the attribute values are stored within an MIB table. The MIB table includes rows that each correspond to either the root class or another class. The attribute data is stored within the row that corresponds to its attribute. The MIB table does not include attribute data being stored only within the base class. Attribute data is stored in rows that correspond to other classes, not just the root class.

Applicants' claims also describe a first subclass and a second subclass within the object where the first subclass is a subclass of the base class and the second subclass is a subclass of the first subclass. Attribute data defined for the first and second attributes is stored within only the base class and not within either the first or second subclasses. *Evans* does not teach a first subclass and a second subclass where attribute data for these subclasses is stored only within the base class.

*Evans* does not anticipate Applicants' claims. Therefore, Applicants' claims are believed to be patentable over the cited prior art. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 04.06.05

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa L.B. Yociss  
Reg. No. 36,975  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants